

### Analysis

First, it is noted that the § 102 rejection based on Go is a verbatim rejection of that asserted in the previous Office Action. However, the Examiner did not specifically address the previously filed arguments, and instead indicated that the previously filed arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection in the instant Office Action. Therefore, it appears that the § 102 rejection was withdrawn and the Examiner mistakenly included the language directed to the § 102 rejection under Go in the instant Office Action.

However, if the rejection is being maintained, the previously filed arguments are incorporated by reference in this Response.

Turning to the § 103 rejection, as noted by the Examiner, Go fails to disclose that the contact portion may be metallized.<sup>1</sup> The Examiner thus relies on WO '814, which was cited by Applicant in an IDS.

Indeed, WO '814 discloses the same cam mechanism found in Go.<sup>2</sup> Although the Examiner does not specifically point out which feature of WO '814 is the alleged metallized portion, there is no metallized contact portion found between the first and second cams, and thus, suffers from the same deficiencies as Go.

WO '814 discloses a spring connector pin 3 which is inserted through the hinge shaft 2. The spring connector pin 3 is illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4, and includes a cylinder 31, a conductive

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Examiner states "a contact portion between the first and second cam is conductive, i.e., metallized (col. 3 lines 21-55)", this appears to be an error since the following sentence states "Go fails to claim that the contact portion may be metallized."

<sup>2</sup> See Fig. 2.

bar 32 and a coil spring 33.<sup>3</sup> The spring connector pin 3 does not include any feature which involves a contact portion between a first cam portion and a second cam portion. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the spring connector pin 3 is inserted through the alleged cams, but is not associated with the surface contact between the two cams. The projection and indentation surfaces of the cams form the contact surfaces, and the spring connector pin 3 does not intrude between these surfaces. In fact, the through hole 44 is larger than the spring connector pin 31, so that the hinge shaft 2 can rotate without hindrance of the cam hinge 4.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the spring connector pin 3 fits through the shaft hole and provides a rotary shaft to the cam mechanism similar to the wire 80 in Go. Since the cam mechanism in WO '814 is identical to that disclosed in Go (compare Fig. 2 in WO '814 to Fig. 2 in Go), it is easily recognized that there is no teaching or suggestion for providing a metal contact portion between the first and second cam mechanisms in Go based on this spring connector pin of WO '814.

Another metallized portion, i.e., the first connection terminal 7,<sup>5</sup> is disposed in the knuckle portion of the phone in WO '814. This knuckle portion 210 is located at the sides of the phone as illustrated in Fig. 1. However, the cam mechanism is not located in this knuckle portion. See Fig. 10. Thus, this connection terminal 7 is not associated with the contact portion between the first and second cam mechanisms in WO '814, and thus, provides no motivation for providing a metallized contact portion for the cams in Go.

---

<sup>3</sup> See page 13 of WO '814.

<sup>4</sup> See page 12 of WO '814.

<sup>5</sup> See page 14 of WO '814.

Finally, a third connection terminal 95 is also provided.<sup>6</sup> As with the other conductive members in WO '814, it is completely unassociated with the contact surfaces of the cam mechanism.

Still further, in the Office Action the Examiner asserts that WO '814 discloses "to use conductive means in the knuckles of the hinge to keep tension on the means so as to keep two conductive pieces together to communicate a signal" and therefore, "it would have been obvious...to add such a feature to Go, as to make it easy to re-install the flip". Although there may have been a motivation to modify Go to include conductive means in the knuckles, this does not translate to providing a metallized contact portion between the two cam surfaces. As mentioned above, there is simply no teaching or suggestion in the references, whether taken alone or in combination, for providing a metal member for the contact portion between the first and second cam portions.

In view of the deficiencies of Go, Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections of claims 1-3 and requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

---

<sup>6</sup> See page 21 of WO '814.

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/757,573

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 30, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith  
Registration No. 43,042

Attorney Docket No.: Q59273